arXiv:1612.06205v1 [math.OC] 19 Dec 2016

Hankel-Norm Approximation of Descriptor Systems

Steffen Werner, Peter Benner

***Abstract*—The Hankel-norm approximation is a model reduction method which provides the best approximation in the Hankel semi-norm. In this paper the computation of the optimal Hankel-norm approximation is generalized to the case of linear time-invariant continuous-time descriptor systems. An efficient algorithm is developed by refining the generalized balanced truncation square-root method. For a wide practical usage, adaptations of the introduced algorithm towards stable computations and sparse systems are made as well as an approach for a projection-free algorithm. To show the approximation behavior of the introduced method, a numerical example is presented.**

***Index Terms*—Computational methods, differential-algebraic systems, Hankel singular values, linear systems, model reduction.**

I. Introduction

TODAY, many different real-world applications, like chemical processes, electrical circuits and networks, or computational fluid dynamics, are modeled by systems of differential-algebraic equations. Since experiments can be very costly, time-consuming, and expensive, these models are used for simulations and the design of controllers. For all further considerations, we will consider the resulting linear time-invariant continuous-time descriptor systems in the form

$$\begin{aligned} E\dot{x}(t) &= Ax(t) + Bu(t), \\ y(t) &= Cx(t) + Du(t), \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

with $E, A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times m}$, $C \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times n}$, $D \in \mathbb{R}^{p\times m}$. The input-output behavior of the system (1) is usually described by its transfer function, given by $G(s) = C(sE-A)^{-1}B+D$, and the realization of G is written as quintuple (E, A, B, C, D). The controls $u(t) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ are used to influence the internal states $x(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ in order to get the desired outputs $y(t) \in \mathbb{R}^p$. Usually, the numbers of inputs and outputs are very small in contrast to the number of differential algebraic equations n which quickly enlarges due to different reasons like a required accuracy. For this reason, the usage of complete models often reaches the limits of computational resources like memory and computation time. Since the acquired data for the model often contain a huge amount of redundancies, it is possible to approximate the original model by a new system with a much smaller number of differential-algebraic equations. The task of model reduction is now to construct a reduced-order descriptor system

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{E}\dot{\hat{x}}(t) &= \hat{A}\hat{x}(t) + \hat{B}u(t), \\ \hat{y}(t) &= \hat{C}\hat{x}(t) + \hat{D}u(t), \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

of order $r \ll n$, such that its transfer function $\hat{G}(s) = \hat{C}(s\hat{E} - \hat{A})^{-1}\hat{B} + \hat{D}$ approximates the transfer function G in some norm.

Many model reduction techniques were originally developed for the standard system case, where the descriptor term E is the identity matrix I_n (or at least nonsingular). But in recent years, quite a few of these methods have been extended to the case of descriptor systems with singular E matrices. There are different approaches for the construction of (2), e.g., matrix equations can be used to determine a measure for truncatable states [1], or the transfer function can be approximated by rational interpolation [2].

A special technique of model reduction is the computation of the optimal Hankel-norm approximation (HNA). This technique actually provides a best approximation in the Hankel semi-norm. Based on the work of Adamjan, Arov, and Krein about the approximation of Hankel matrices, an algorithm for the computation of the HNA for standard systems was introduced by Glover in [3].

The generalization of the HNA to the descriptor system case was already mentioned by Cao, Saltik, and Weiland in [4]. They are using the Weierstrass canonical form for an explicit construction of reduced decoupled subsystems. The main problem of this method is the computation of the Weierstrass canonical form which is numerically costly and unstable. Also additional conditions, like C-controllability and C-observability of the system [5], have to be assumed.

That is why, in this paper, a new efficient algorithm for the computation of the generalized Hankel-norm approximation (GHNA) will be proposed based on the generalized balanced truncation (GBT) method. Therefor, in Section II we recall the mathematical background of descriptor systems and the HNA. Then we consider the original HNA method for standard systems as well as the GBT method to introduce the GHNA method in Section III. To get an applicable method, in Section IV the algorithm is adjusted to the case of small proper Hankel singular values, sparse and dense systems. The results of a numerical example are then displayed in Section V.

II. Mathematical Basics

First of all, the matrix pencil $\lambda E - A$ of the system (1) has to be assumed to be regular, i.e., there exists a $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\det(\lambda E - A) \neq 0$. In this case, the Weierstrass canonical form exists for $\lambda E - A$, as there are invertible matrices W, T such that

$$W(\lambda E - A)T = \lambda \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_f} & 0 \\ 0 & N \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} J & 0 \\ 0 & I_{n_\infty} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{3}$$

where J and N are both in Jordan canonical form, J is regular, and N is nilpotent with index ν. The numbers n_f and n_∞ are the dimensions of the deflating subspaces corresponding to the finite and infinite eigenvalues of $\lambda E - A$, respectively. Then, the spectral projectors onto the left and right deflating subspaces corresponding to the finite eigenvalues of the matrix pencil $\lambda E - A$ can be defined as

$$P_\ell = W \begin{bmatrix} I_{n_f} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} W^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad P_r = T^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_{n_\infty} \end{bmatrix} T, \tag{4}$$

with W and T as in the Weierstrass canonical form (3).

Another necessary assumption is the c-stability of the matrix pencil $\lambda E - A$, i.e., all finite eigenvalues of $\lambda E - A$ lie in the open left half-plane. In this case, the proper controllability and observability Gramians are defined as the unique, positive semidefinite solutions of the projected generalized continuous-time Lyapunov equations

$$E\mathcal{G}_{pc}A^T + A\mathcal{G}_{pc}E^T + P_\ell BB^T P_\ell^T = 0, \quad \mathcal{G}_{pc} = P_r\mathcal{G}_{pc}P_r^T, \tag{5}$$

$$E^T\mathcal{G}_{po}A + A^T\mathcal{G}_{po}E + P_r^T C^T C P_r = 0, \quad \mathcal{G}_{pc} = P_\ell^T\mathcal{G}_{pc}P_\ell, \tag{6}$$

with P_ℓ and P_r the spectral projectors corresponding to the finite eigenvalues (4), see [6]. Furthermore, the improper controllability and observability Gramians are given as the unique, positive semidefinite

This work has been submitted to the IEEE for possible publication. Copyright may be transferred without notice, after which this version may no longer be accessible

Both authors are with the Max Planck Institute for Dynamics of Complex Technical Systems, Sandtorstr. 1, D-39106 Magdeburg (Germany). {werner, benner}@mpi-magdeburg.mpg.de

solutions of the projected generalized discrete-time Lyapunov equations

$$A\mathcal{G}_{ic}A^T - E\mathcal{G}_{ic}E^T - Q_\ell BB^T Q_\ell^T = 0, \quad \mathcal{G}_{ic} = Q_r \mathcal{G}_{ic} Q_r^T, \text{ (7)}$$
$$A^T\mathcal{G}_{io}A - E^T\mathcal{G}_{io}E - Q_r^T C^T C Q_r = 0, \quad \mathcal{G}_{io} = Q_\ell^T \mathcal{G}_{io} Q_\ell, \text{ (8)}$$

with $Q_\ell = I_n - P_\ell$ and $Q_r = I_n - P_r$ the left and right spectral projectors onto the deflating subspaces corresponding to the infinite eigenvalues of the matrix pencil $\lambda E - A$, see [6].

Using the system Gramians, the set of Hankel singular values is defined in the following, see [5].

Definition 1. The square roots of the n_f largest eigenvalues of $\mathcal{G}_{pc}E^T\mathcal{G}_{po}E$ denoted by $\varsigma_1 \geq \varsigma_2 \geq \ldots \geq \varsigma_{n_f}$ are the proper Hankel singular values of (1). The square roots of the n_∞ largest eigenvalues of $\mathcal{G}_{ic}A^T\mathcal{G}_{io}A$ denoted by $\theta_1 \geq \theta_2 \geq \ldots \geq \theta_{n_\infty}$ are the improper Hankel singular values of (1).

In case of a non-singular descriptor term E, the proper Hankel singular values are the classical Hankel singular values of the system. Therefore, an equivalent energy interpretation of the proper Hankel singular values exists which proposes the truncation of states corresponding to small proper Hankel singular values. Unfortunately, this does not hold for the improper Hankel singular value since these correspond to the constraints of the system. So the truncation of non-zero improper Hankel singular values may result in physically meaningless systems.

The mapping from past inputs $u_- : (-\infty, 0] \to \mathbb{R}^m$ into future outputs $y_+ : (0, +\infty] \to \mathbb{R}^p$ is described by the Hankel operator $y_+ = \mathcal{H}u_-$. A generalization of this operator to the case of descriptor systems can be found in [4]. The measure of the influence of past inputs on future outputs in the $\mathcal{L}_2$-norm leads to the definition of the Hankel-norm for descriptor systems.

Definition 2. The Hankel-norm of a system G is given by

$$\|G\|_H = \sup_{u_- \in \mathcal{W}_2^{\nu-1}(-\infty,0]} \frac{\|y_+\|_{\mathcal{L}_2}}{\|u_-\|_{\mathcal{L}_2}}, \tag{9}$$

where $\mathcal{W}_2^{\nu-1}(-\infty, 0]$ denotes the Sobolev space of $\nu - 1$ times weakly differentiable functions w.r.t. the $\mathcal{L}_2$ inner product on the interval $(-\infty, 0]$ and $\|.\|_{\mathcal{L}_2}$ the $\mathcal{L}_2$-norm.

In case of standard systems, the Hankel-norm (9) simplifies to

$$\|G\|_H = \varsigma_{\max}(G),$$

with $\varsigma_{\max}(G)$ the largest Hankel singular value of the system G. It should be noted, that the Hankel-norm is only a semi-norm on the Hardy space $\mathcal{H}_\infty$.

III. Generalized Hankel-Norm Approximation

A. Algorithm for Standard Systems

Before the descriptor system case can be developed, the algorithm for the standard system case introduced by Glover in [3] has to be considered. As the first step, a balanced minimal realization of the given standard system (I_n, A, B, C, D) is computed. This can normally be done by the balanced truncation square root method. Since the resulting system is balanced and minimal, the system Gramians are equal and diagonal

$$\mathcal{G}_{pc} = \mathcal{G}_{po} = \operatorname{diag}(\varsigma_1, \varsigma_2, \ldots, \varsigma_{n_{\min}}),$$

with $\varsigma_1, \ldots, \varsigma_{n_{\min}}$ all non-zero Hankel singular values of the system and $n_{\min}$ the degree of the minimal realization.

Next, the system has to be partitioned by the order r such that

$$\varsigma_1 \geq \ldots \geq \varsigma_r > \varsigma_{r+1} = \ldots = \varsigma_{r+k+1} > \varsigma_{r+k+2} \geq \ldots \geq \varsigma_{n_{\min}},$$

with $k \geq 1$ being the multiplicity of the $(r+1)$-st Hankel singular value. So the Gramians are reordered to separate the block of the $(r+1)$-st Hankel singular value as

$$\check{\mathcal{G}}_{pc} = \check{\mathcal{G}}_{po} = \begin{bmatrix} \check{\Sigma} & \\ & \varsigma_{r+1} I_k \end{bmatrix}, \tag{10}$$

with $\check{\Sigma} = \operatorname{diag}(\varsigma_1, \ldots, \varsigma_r, \varsigma_{r+k+2}, \ldots, \varsigma_{n_{\min}})$. Accordingly to (10), the remaining system matrices have to be permuted and partitioned

$$\check{A} = \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \check{B} = \begin{bmatrix} B_1 \\ B_2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \check{C} = \begin{bmatrix} C_1, & C_2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The partitioned system is transformed by the following formulas

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{A} &= \Gamma^{-1}(\varsigma_{r+1}^2 A_{11}^T + \check{\Sigma} A_{11} \check{\Sigma} + \varsigma_{r+1} C_1^T U B_1^T), \\ \tilde{B} &= \Gamma^{-1}(\check{\Sigma} B_1 - \varsigma_{r+1} C_1^T U), \\ \tilde{C} &= C_1 \check{\Sigma} - \varsigma_{r+1} U B_1^T, \ \tilde{D} = D + \varsigma_{r+1} U, \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

with $\Gamma = \check{\Sigma}^2 - \varsigma_{r+1}^2 I_{n-k}$ and $U = (C_2^T)^\dagger B_2$. Here $M^\dagger$ denotes the Moore-Penrose pseudo-inverse of M. This system is constructed such that the error transfer function $\mathcal{E} = G - \tilde{G}$ is scaled all-pass with $\tilde{G}$ the transfer function of (11), i.e., it holds

$$\mathcal{E}(s)\mathcal{E}^T(-s) = \varsigma_{r+1} I_p.$$

For the approximation error one obtains

$$\|\mathcal{E}\|_H = \|\mathcal{E}\|_{\mathcal{L}_\infty} = \varsigma_{r+1}. \tag{12}$$

The transfer function $\tilde{G}$ of (11) has exactly $n_{\min} - k - r$ unstable poles. As last step, an additive decomposition of $\tilde{G}$ is computed such that $\tilde{G} = G_h + G_+$, where G_+ is an anti-stable transfer function of order $n_{\min} - k - r$ and G_h is a stable transfer function of order r. Since the Hankel-norm only depends on the stable part of the system, the error (12) in the Hankel-norm does not change if the unstable part is removed, such that

$$\|G - G_h\|_H = \varsigma_{r+1}. \tag{13}$$

B. Computing a Balanced Realization for Descriptor Systems

As in the standard method, for descriptor systems, a balanced conditionally minimal realization shall be computed. The term conditionally minimal means that the system is minimal except of the reduction of the index-1 parts of E, see [7]. The computation will be done by the generalized balanced truncation square root method (GBT(SR)). The basic idea of the GBT is the computation of a balanced realization and the truncation of unnecessary states.

Definition 3. A realization of a descriptor system (1) is called balanced if

$$\mathcal{G}_{pc} = \mathcal{G}_{po} = \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{G}_{ic} = \mathcal{G}_{io} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \Theta \end{bmatrix},$$

with the proper Hankel singular values $\Sigma = \operatorname{diag}(\varsigma_1, \ldots, \varsigma_{n_f})$ and the improper Hankel singular values $\Theta = \operatorname{diag}(\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_{n_\infty})$.

The truncation of the states is made with respect to the computed Hankel singular values. The proper Hankel singular values have the same meaning as the classical Hankel singular values in the standard case, i.e., states corresponding to small proper Hankel singular values are difficult to control and observe at the same time and can be omitted. In case of the improper Hankel singular values, only zeros can be truncated since the truncation of non-zero improper Hankel singular values results in physically meaningless approximations [5]. The number of non-zero improper Hankel singular values is equal to the rank of the matrix $\mathcal{G}_{ic}A^T\mathcal{G}_{io}A$ which can in fact be bounded

$$\operatorname{rank}(\mathcal{G}_{ic}A^T\mathcal{G}_{io}A) \leq \min(\nu m, \nu p, n_\infty),$$

with ν, index of the system, m, number of inputs, p, number of outputs, and n_∞, dimension of the deflating subspace corresponding to the infinite eigenvalues of $\lambda E - A$. So for large n_∞, the descriptor system (1) can be reduced significantly by the truncation of zero improper Hankel singular values.

One method to compute the balanced truncation of a descriptor system is the square-root method. Therefore, consider the skinny singular value decompositions

$$L_p^T E R_p = \begin{bmatrix} U_1, & U_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \Sigma_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \Sigma_2 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} V_1^T \\ V_2^T \end{bmatrix}, \tag{14}$$

$$L_i^T A R_i = U_3 \Theta_3 V_3^T, \tag{15}$$

with $\mathcal{G}_{pc} = R_p R_p^T$, $\mathcal{G}_{po} = L_p L_p^T$, $\mathcal{G}_{ic} = R_i R_i^T$, and $\mathcal{G}_{io} = L_i L_i^T$. The matrices $\begin{bmatrix} U_1, & U_2 \end{bmatrix}$, $\begin{bmatrix} V_1, & V_2 \end{bmatrix}$, U_3 and V_3 have orthonormal columns and the diagonal matrices Σ_1, Σ_2, and Θ_3 contain the non-zero proper and improper Hankel singular values, respectively. The partition of the proper Hankel singular values is chosen such that Σ_1 contains all the desired Hankel singular values and Σ_2 the undesired ones. By using the singular value decompositions in (14) and (15), the following transformation matrices can be defined

$$\begin{aligned} W_\ell &= \begin{bmatrix} L_p U_1 \Sigma_1^{-\frac{1}{2}}, & L_i U_3 \Theta_3^{-\frac{1}{2}} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \ell}, \\ T_\ell &= \begin{bmatrix} R_p V_1 \Sigma_1^{-\frac{1}{2}}, & R_i V_3 \Theta_3^{-\frac{1}{2}} \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \ell}, \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where $\ell = \ell_f + \ell_\infty$ is the sum of the number of desired proper Hankel singular values ℓ_f and the non-zero improper Hankel singular values ℓ_∞. The transformed realization

$$(\hat{E}, \hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{C}, D) = (W_\ell^T E T_\ell, W_\ell^T A T_\ell, W_\ell^T B, C T_\ell, D) \tag{17}$$

is of order ℓ and balanced with the set of Hankel singular values contained in Σ_1 and Θ_3. The resulting matrix pencil $\lambda \hat{E} - \hat{A}$ is a resembling of the Weierstrass canonical form (3), such that

$$\hat{E} = \begin{bmatrix} I_{\ell_f} & 0 \\ 0 & E_\infty \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{A} = \begin{bmatrix} A_f & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\ell_\infty} \end{bmatrix} \tag{18}$$

hold, where $A_f \in \mathbb{R}^{\ell_f \times \ell_f}$ is non-singular and $E_\infty \in \mathbb{R}^{\ell_\infty \times \ell_\infty}$ is nilpotent with index ν.

Due to the reason that only non-zero improper Hankel singular values have been truncated, the polynomial part of the system G has not changed. So it can be shown that the same error bound as for the classical balanced truncation method holds. Let $\hat{G}$ be the transformed descriptor system (17), then it holds

$$\|G - \hat{G}\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} \leq 2 \sum_{k=\ell_f+1}^{n_f} \varsigma_k(G),$$

with $\varsigma_k(G)$ the k-th proper Hankel singular value of G.

C. Hankel-Norm Approximation of Descriptor Systems

The main idea of the approach for a GHNA method, considered here, is the exploitation of the reduced form (18). So let the matrices $\hat{B}$ and $\hat{C}$ be partitioned according to (18) as

$$\hat{B} = \begin{bmatrix} B_f \\ B_\infty \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{C} = \begin{bmatrix} B_f, & B_\infty \end{bmatrix}.$$

Using this partition, the system $(\hat{E}, \hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{C}, D)$ automatically decouples into its slow subsystem

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_f(t) &= A_f x_f(t) + B_f u(t), \\ y_f(t) &= C_f x_f(t) \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

and its fast subsystem

$$\begin{aligned} E_\infty \dot{x}_\infty(t) &= x_\infty(t) + B_\infty u(t), \\ y_\infty(t) &= C_\infty x_\infty(t) + D u(t). \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

First let us consider the fast subsystem (20). Since the GBT was used to compute the system (20), there are no zero improper Hankel singular values anymore. As mentioned before, there is no meaningful further reduction concerning the improper Hankel singular values without generating physically meaningless results, so the fast subsystem stays unchanged.

So let us consider the slow subsystem (19). It is easy to see that (19) is a standard system. Also beneficial properties, resulting from the applied balanced truncation method, still hold for this subsystem which means it is stable and balanced.

Let the original system be decomposed $G = G_{sp} + P$ into its slow subsystem G_{sp} and its fast subsystem P. By the truncation of only zero proper Hankel singular values, the system (19) is a minimal realization of the original slow subsystem G_{sp}. Now the standard HNA method, mentioned in the previous section, can be applied to (19). As result, an r-th order standard HNA is computed

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x}_h(t) &= A_h x_h(t) + B_h u(t), \\ y_h(t) &= C_h x_h(t) + D_h u(t). \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

To get an optimal HNA of the descriptor system (1), now the computed standard HNA (21) and the reduced-order fast subsystem (20) have to be coupled

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} I_r & 0 \\ 0 & E_\infty \end{bmatrix} \dot{\hat{x}}(t) &= \begin{bmatrix} A_h & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\ell_\infty} \end{bmatrix} \hat{x}(t) + \begin{bmatrix} B_h \\ B_\infty \end{bmatrix} u(t), \\ \hat{y}(t) &= \begin{bmatrix} C_h, & C_\infty \end{bmatrix} \hat{x}(t) + (D_h + D) u(t). \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Now, we consider the properties of the resulting GHNA.

Theorem 1. *Let G be a c-stable descriptor system* (1) *with a regular matrix pencil. The ℓ-th order GHNA* (22)*, with its transfer function $\hat{G}$ and $\ell = r + \ell_\infty$, has the following properties:*

1) *The realization of $\hat{G}$ is conditionally minimal and c-stable.*
2) *The absolute error in the Hankel-norm is given by*

$$\|G - \hat{G}\|_H = \varsigma_{r+1}(G),$$

where $\varsigma_{r+1}(G)$ is the $(r+1)$-st proper Hankel singular value of G.

3) *The absolute error in the $\mathcal{H}_\infty$-norm can be bounded by*

$$\|G - \hat{G}\|_H \leq 2 \sum_{k=r+1}^{n_f} \varsigma_k(G),$$

where $\varsigma_k(G)$ is the k-th proper Hankel singular values of G.

Proof. Let $G = G_{sp} + P$ be the original system and $\tilde{G} = G_b + P_b$ the balanced, conditionally minimal realization obtained by the GBT(SR) method. Here G_{sp}, G_b denote the slow subsystems and P, P_b the fast ones. The GHNA is constructed by

$$\hat{G} = G_h + P_b, \tag{23}$$

where G_h is the r-th order standard HNA of G_b.

First, consider part 1). The balanced realization $\tilde{G}$ is conditional minimal and c-stable. So by construction (23), both of these properties are transferred to the GHNA.

Now consider the error formulas in 2) and 3). Therefore, let $\mathcal{E} = G - \hat{G}$ be the error system of the GHNA. Then it holds

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E} &= G - \hat{G} = G_{sp} + P - G_h - P_b \\ &= G_b + P_b - G_h - P_b \\ &= G_b - G_h, \end{aligned}$$

since the balanced realization $\tilde{G}$ is conditionally minimal and therefore $G_b = G_{sp}$ and $P_b = P$. So with the error bound of the standard method (13) one obtains

$$\|G - \hat{G}\|_H = \|G_b - G_h\|_H = \varsigma_{r+1}(G_b) = \varsigma_{r+1}(G).$$

Using the same approach, the error in the $\mathcal{H}_\infty$-norm is given by

$$\|G-\hat{G}\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} = \|G_b - G_h\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} \leq 2\sum_{k=r+1}^{n_f} \varsigma_k(G),$$

if the $\mathcal{H}_\infty$-norm error bound for the standard r-th order HNA from [8] is used. □

In the following, the complete GHNA method is summarized.

Generalized Hankel-Norm Approximation Method.

1: Solve the continuous-time Lyapunov equations (5) and (6) for the Cholesky factorizations $\mathcal{G}_{pc} = R_p R_p^T$ and $\mathcal{G}_{po} = L_p L_p^T$.
2: Solve the discrete-time Lyapunov equations (7) and (8) for the Cholesky factorizations $\mathcal{G}_{ic} = R_i R_i^T$ and $\mathcal{G}_{io} = L_i L_i^T$.
3: Compute the two skinny singular value decompositions

$$L_p^T E R_p = U_1 \Sigma V_1^T \text{and } L_i^T A R_i = U_2 \Theta V_2^T.$$

4: Compute the transformation matrices

$$W_p = L_p U_1 \Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}},\ T_p = R_p V_1 \Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}},$$
$$W_i = L_i U_2 \Theta^{-\frac{1}{2}},\ T_i = R_i V_2 \Theta^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

5: Compute the minimal balanced realization of the slow subsystem

$$(I_{\ell_f}, A_f, B_f, C_f, 0) = (W_p^T E T_p, W_p^T A T_p, W_p^T B, C T_p, 0).$$

6: Choose the proper Hankel singular value ς_{r+1}.
7: Permute and partition the Gramians of the slow subsystem

$$\check{\mathcal{G}}_{pc} = \check{\mathcal{G}}_{po} = \operatorname{diag}(\check{\Sigma}, \varsigma_{r+1} I_k),$$

and the slow subsystem

$$\check{A} = \begin{bmatrix} A_{11} A_{12} \\ A_{21} A_{22} \end{bmatrix}, \check{B} = \begin{bmatrix} B_1 \\ B_2 \end{bmatrix}, \check{C} = \begin{bmatrix} C_1, C_2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

8: Compute the transformation

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{A} &= \Gamma^{-1}(\varsigma_{r+1}^2 A_{11}^T + \check{\Sigma} A_{11} \check{\Sigma} + \varsigma_{r+1} C_1^T U B_1^T), \\ \tilde{B} &= \Gamma^{-1}(\check{\Sigma} B_1 - \varsigma_{r+1} C_1^T U), \\ \tilde{C} &= C_1 \check{\Sigma} - \varsigma_{r+1} U B_1^T, \\ \tilde{D} &= \varsigma_{r+1} U, \end{aligned}$$

with $U = (C_2^T)^\dagger B_2$ and $\Gamma = \check{\Sigma}^2 - \varsigma_{r+1}^2 I_{\ell_f - k}$.
9: Compute the additive decomposition

$$\tilde{G}(s) = \tilde{C}(sI_{\ell_f - k} - \tilde{A})\tilde{B} + \tilde{D} = G_h(s) + F(s),$$

where F is anti-stable and G_h stable with the realization $(I_r, A_h, B_h, C_h, D_h)$.
10: Compute the balanced realization of the fast subsystem

$$\begin{aligned} &(E_\infty, I_{\ell_\infty}, B_\infty, C_\infty, D) \\ &\quad = (W_i^T E T_i, W_i^T A T_i, W_i^T B, C T_i, D). \end{aligned}$$

11: Couple the resulting subsystems

$$\begin{aligned} &(\hat{E}, \hat{A}, \hat{B}, \hat{C}, \hat{D}) \\ &\quad = \left(\begin{bmatrix} I_r & 0 \\ 0 & E_\infty \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} A_h & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\ell_\infty} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} B_h \\ B_\infty \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} C_h, C_\infty \end{bmatrix}, D_h + D \right). \end{aligned}$$

IV. Adjustments of the Algorithm

A. An Approximated Method

The GHNA method quickly becomes numerically unstable. This problem arises from the use of Glover's transformation formulas (11) for the construction of a scaled all-pass error transfer function. It is easy to see that the scaling term $\Gamma^{-1} = (\check{\Sigma}^2 - \varsigma_{r+1}^2 I_{n_{\min}-k})^{-1}$ leads to large numerical errors for small proper Hankel singular values. This happens if either the chosen value ς_{r+1} is very small or the remaining proper Hankel singular values in $\check{\Sigma}$ are very small. In further considerations, only the second case will be treated.

Small proper Hankel singular values can arise from numerical errors during the computation of the minimal realization which results in extremely small quasi-zero proper Hankel singular values. So one approach to solve this problem is to compute a smaller balanced truncation of the slow subsystem than the minimal realization. In this case, an additional error is made since the balanced realization is only an approximation of the original system. To get a measure for the additional error, let G_b be the computed balanced truncation of order n_b of the slow subsystem G_{sp}. Then it has been shown in [3] that in the Hankel-norm it holds

$$\|G_{sp} - G_b\|_H \leq 2\sum_{k=n_b+1}^{n_f} \varsigma_k(G_{sp}), \tag{24}$$

with n_f the order of the system G_{sp}. For the overall error, let $G = G_{sp} + P$ be the original descriptor system and $\tilde{G} = G_b + P_b$ the balanced realization with G_b of order n_b. The generalized Hankel-norm approximation is denoted by $\hat{G} = G_h + P_b$, where the r-th order standard Hankel-norm approximation G_h was computed from the balanced realization G_b. Using (24) one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \|G-\hat{G}\|_H &= \|G_{sp} + P - G_h - P_b\|_H = \|G_{sp} - G_h\|_H \\ &= \|G_{sp} - G_b + G_b - G_h\|_H \\ &\leq \|G_b - G_h\|_H + \|G_{sp} - G_b\|_H \\ &\leq \varsigma_{r+1}(G_b) + 2\sum_{k=n_b+1}^{n_f} \varsigma_k(G_{sp}). \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

Since all the Hankel singular values of G_b and G_{sp} are also the proper Hankel singular values of G, the resulting error can be written as

$$\|G-\hat{G}\|_H \leq \varsigma_{r+1}(G) + 2\sum_{k=n_b+1}^{n_f} \varsigma_k(G).$$

Concerning the $\mathcal{H}_\infty$-norm, the approach in (25) can be used to get

$$\|G-\hat{G}\|_{\mathcal{H}_\infty} \leq 2\sum_{k=r+1}^{n_f} \varsigma_k(G),$$

which is the same error bound as for the exact method.

This approximated version of the GHNA takes advantage of the use of the GBT(SR) method in form of the adaptive choice of the order n_b. So it is possible to choose n_b with respect to the chosen proper Hankel singular value ς_{r+1} such that

$$2\sum_{k=n_b+1}^{n_f} \varsigma_k(G) \ll \varsigma_{r+1}(G),$$

so the resulting additional error becomes negligible small concerning the original Hankel-norm error.

The adjustments in the implementation of the GHNA method are only small, since the only thing to do is to allow the truncation of non-zero proper Hankel singular values. In this case, the Σ_2 term in (14) with the undesired proper Hankel singular values is not empty and only U_1, Σ_1, and V_1 are used for further computations.

It can be noted that it is possible to omit the scaling of $\tilde{A}$ and $\tilde{B}$ by setting Γ as the transformed descriptor term $\tilde{E}$ in (11). There is no further structural problem since the resulting reduced-order system is already in descriptor form. Still, the described method is important since the resulting reduced-order term E_r would be bad conditioned which can lead to problems during later simulations.

Another advantage can be seen in the accuracy of the balanced realization. The GBT(SR) method needs a scaling of the transformation matrices (16) using the inverse remaining Hankel singular values which is more accurate if the small proper Hankel singular values are already truncated. Also in the later steps of the algorithm, a smaller minimal realization results in reduced computational costs concerning the transformation and additive decomposition of the system.

B. Application to Sparse Systems

A frequently appearing case in practice is the model reduction of large-scale sparse descriptor systems. In this case, the system matrices from the descriptor system (1) are in a large-scale sparse form, i.e., the dimension n is large, the matrices can be stored using $\mathcal{O}(n)$ memory and the matrix-vector multiplication can be computed with $\mathcal{O}(n)$ effort. Often these matrices are results of the discretization of partial differential equations.

Considering the GHNA, one can observe that the reduced-order balanced fast and slow subsystems have to be stored dense due to the use of the transformation matrices. So the only adaptation of the method to the sparse case can be made by adjusting the computation methods for the projected generalized Lyapunov equations (5)-(8). It has been observed that the eigenvalues of the symmetric positive semidefinite solutions of Lyapunov equations with low-rank right-hand sides generally decay rapidly. The same result holds for the projected Lyapunov equations [9]. Therefore, the system Gramians can be approximated by low-rank Cholesky factorizations, e.g., $\mathcal{G}_{pc} \approx ZZ^T$ with $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times k}$ and $k \ll n$. Low-rank computation methods for all required projected generalized Lyapunov equations can be found in [9].

C. A Projection-Free Approach

Often, there is no explicit construction formula for the spectral projectors P_ℓ and P_r, so they have to be explicitly computed for the use in the projected Lyapunov equations (5)-(8). Since the GHNA is based on the GBT(SR) method, an alternative approach to the use of spectral projectors is given in [10].

As already used in the GHNA, the GBT method can be interpreted as a decoupling of the original system into the slow and fast subsystems and the individual reduction of both. Therefore, consider the generalized block triangular form. There are orthogonal matrices U and V such that

$$E = V\begin{bmatrix} E_f & E_u \\ 0 & E_\infty \end{bmatrix} U^T \quad \text{and} \quad A = V\begin{bmatrix} A_f & A_u \\ 0 & A_\infty \end{bmatrix} U^T,$$

where the matrix pencil $\lambda E_f - A_f$ contains all the finite eigenvalues of $\lambda E - A$ and the matrix pencil $\lambda E_\infty - A_\infty$ has only infinite eigenvalues. For the computation of a block diagonalization of the system, the generalized Sylvester equation

$$E_f Y - Z E_\infty = -E_u, \quad A_f Y - Z A_\infty = -A_u,$$

has to be solved for Y and Z, see [11]. Using all of these matrices for the generalized state space transformation of the original descriptor system (1), one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} E_f & 0 \\ 0 & E_\infty \end{bmatrix} \dot{\tilde{x}}(t) &= \begin{bmatrix} A_f & 0 \\ 0 & A_\infty \end{bmatrix} \tilde{x}(t) + \begin{bmatrix} B_f \\ B_\infty \end{bmatrix} u(t), \\ y(t) &= \begin{bmatrix} C_f & C_\infty \end{bmatrix} \tilde{x}(t) + Du(t), \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

where the remaining matrices are constructed as

$$V^T B = \begin{bmatrix} B_u \\ B_\infty \end{bmatrix}, \quad B_f = B_u - Z B_\infty,$$
$$CU = \begin{bmatrix} C_f \\ C_u \end{bmatrix}, \quad C_\infty = C_f Y + C_u.$$

Obviously, the realization in (26) decouples into the fast and slow subsystems of (1). Since the spectral projectors of the subsystems are identity matrices, the corresponding Lyapunov equations (5)-(8) simplify to

$$\begin{aligned} E_f X_{pc} A_f^T + A_f X_{pc} E_f^T + B_f B_f^T &= 0, \\ E_f^T X_{po} A_f + A_f^T X_{po} E_f + C_f^T C_f &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

for the slow subsystem and

$$\begin{aligned} A_\infty X_{ic} A_\infty^T - E_\infty X_{ic} E_\infty^T - B_\infty B_\infty^T &= 0, \\ A_\infty^T X_{io} A_\infty - E_\infty^T X_{io} E_\infty - C_\infty^T C_\infty &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

for the fast subsystem. The matrices X_{pc}, X_{po} correspond to the proper controllability and observability Gramians, and X_{ic}, X_{io} to the improper ones. The rest of the GHNA algorithm stays the same.

V. Numerical Example

To test the introduced model reduction method, a numerical example is presented in the following. The Stokes equation describes the flow of fluids at very low velocities without convection and coincides with the linearization of the Navier-Stokes equation around the zero-state. The spatial discretization of the Stokes equation by the finite volume method leads to a descriptor system of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{v}_h(t) &= A_{11} v_h(t) + A_{12} p_h(t) + B_1 u(t), \\ 0 &= A_{12}^T v_h(t) + B_2 u(t), \\ y(t) &= C_1 v_h(t) + C_2 p_h(t), \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

where v_h and p_h are the semi-discretized vectors of velocity and pressure, respectively, and the matrices B_1, B_2, C_1, C_2 are all vectors. For matrix pencils like in (27) the spectral projectors P_ℓ and P_r are given by explicit construction formulas

$$P_\ell = \begin{bmatrix} \Pi & -\Pi A_{11} A_{12} (A_{12}^T A_{12})^{-1} \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$
$$P_r = \begin{bmatrix} \Pi & 0 \\ -(A_{12}^T A_{12})^{-1} A_{12}^T A_{11} \Pi & 0, \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\Pi = I_{n_f} - A_{12}(A_{12}^T A_{12})^{-1} A_{12}^T$ is the orthogonal projector onto the kernel of A_{12}^T along the image of A_{12}, see [12]. The generation of data is based on the test example 3.3 in [13]. The Stokes equation was discretized on a uniform staggered grid of the size 80×80 points which leads to a descriptor system of the size $n = 19039$, where the matrix pencil $\lambda E - A$ has $n_f = 6241$ finite eigenvalues and $n_\infty = 12798$ infinite ones. The data was generated to get a full-rank A_{12} such that the system (27) is of index 2.

For the computation, the implementation of the GHNA method was adjusted to the sparse system case and for the solution of the projected continuous-time Lyapunov equations (5) and (6), the solvers from the M-M.E.S.S. toolbox have been adapted [14]. To prevent a drift-off effect of the low-rank factors, the solvers reproject the update matrices in every fourth step. Using these adjusted solvers, the two iterations for the low-rank factors quickly converge after 51 iteration steps. An approximation of the non-zero proper Hankel singular values has been computed using these low-rank factors and the results are displayed in Figure 1.

As mentioned before, it is numerically more stable using a balanced truncation of the slow subsystem than a real minimal realization. For this reason, a tolerance for the allowed proper Hankel singular values was computed as $n \cdot \epsilon$ and multiplied with the largest proper Hankel singular value, with n the order of the system and ϵ the machine epsilon. The resulting bound is printed in Figure 1 and the computed balanced realization is of order 21.

To compute a fourth order standard Hankel-norm approximation for the slow subsystem, the fifth proper Hankel singular value



Figure 1. Computed proper Hankel singular values and the tolerance for the balanced realization.



Figure 2. Absolute error of the GHNA and GBT(SR) transfer functions in the spectral norm with the corresponding error bound.

$\varsigma_5 = 1.8370 \cdot 10^{-6}$ was chosen. The additive decomposition of the transformed realization (11) was made by using the spectral projection routines from the MORLAB toolbox [15].

The projected generalized discrete-time Lyapunov equations (7) and (8) were computed by the projected generalized Smith method, see [9]. In contrast to the continuous-time case, every iteration step was reprojected since the iteration converges after 2 steps at maximum. As result only one non-zero improper Hankel singular value $\theta_1 = 5.3046 \cdot 10^{-18}$ was computed. This implies that the reduced-order system would be of index 1. In this case, the fast subsystem (20) is equivalent to a feed-through term in the form $-C_\infty B_\infty = -1.875 \cdot 10^{-17}$. Since this value is negligible small compared to the resulting feed-through term $\hat{D} = \varsigma_5$ from the HNA method, the state corresponding to this improper Hankel singular value can be truncated, too.

Then, the original semi-discretized Stokes equation is approximated by a GHNA of order 4 ($r = 4$, $\ell_\infty = 0$). The error in the spectral norm of the original and reduced-order transfer function can be seen in Figure 2. Additionally, the corresponding $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ error bound as well as a reduced-order model of the same order computed by the GBT(SR) method are plotted to get an impression of the approximation behavior.

The shown error behavior of the GHNA is typical for Glover's HNA method. Since the reduced-order model is based on an all-pass error transfer function, the error behavior becomes nearly all-pass if the influence of the anti-stable part is negligible small. Also this error approaches the chosen proper Hankel singular value ς_5 which is exactly the error of the approximation in the Hankel-norm.

More examples and tests of used subroutines can be found in [16].

VI. Conclusion

After introducing basic system theoretical aspects for descriptor systems, the standard Hankel-norm approximation algorithm from Glover was shown. By exploiting the generalized balanced truncation square root method, an efficient algorithm for the computation of the generalized Hankel-norm approximation was developed. To get a more stable computation algorithm, an approximated version of the Hankel-norm approximation was shown. For an efficient practical usage, the introduced method was considered for sparse and dense system cases, respectively. The approximation behavior of the method was shown on a large-scale sparse numerical example.

In contrast to the approach of Cao, Saltik, and Weiland, the method, introduced in this paper, has several advantages. First, it has a more stable and efficient computational behavior, due to the fact that the Weierstrass canonical form does not have to be computed. Also the introduced method can be applied to more general descriptor systems since we did not assume C-controllability and C-observability.

References

[1] P. Benner and T. Stykel, "Model order reduction for differential-algebraic equations: a survey," Max Planck Institute Magdeburg, Preprint MPIMD/15-19, Nov. 2015, available from http://www.mpi-magdeburg.mpg.de/preprints/.

[2] S. Gugercin, T. Stykel, and S. Wyatt, "Model reduction of descriptor systems by interpolatory projection methods," *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.*, vol. 35, no. 5, pp. B1010–B1033, 2013.

[3] K. Glover, "All optimal Hankel-norm approximations of linear multivariable systems and their L^∞-error norms," *Internat. J. Control*, vol. 39, no. 6, pp. 1115–1193, 1984.

[4] X. Cao, M. B. Saltik, and S. Weiland, "Hankel model reduction for descriptor systems," in *2015 54th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, Dec. 2015, pp. 4668–4673.

[5] V. Mehrmann and T. Stykel, "Balanced truncation model reduction for large-scale systems in descriptor form," in *Dimension Reduction of Large-Scale Systems*, ser. Lect. Notes Comput. Sci. Eng., P. Benner, V. Mehrmann, and D. C. Sorensen, Eds., vol. 45. Springer-Verlag, Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 2005, pp. 83–115.

[6] T. Stykel, "Analysis and numerical solution of generalized Lyapunov equations," Ph.D. Thesis, Technische Universität Berlin, Berlin, 2002.

[7] V. Sokolov, "Contributions to the minimal realization problem for descriptor systems," Dissertation, Fakultät für Mathematik, TU Chemnitz, 09107 Chemnitz (Germany), Jan. 2006.

[8] A. C. Antoulas, *Approximation of Large-Scale Dynamical Systems*. Philadelphia, PA: SIAM Publications, 2005.

[9] T. Stykel, "Low-rank iterative methods for projected generalized Lyapunov equations," *Electron. Trans. Numer. Anal.*, vol. 30, pp. 187–202, 2008.

[10] ——, "Gramian-based model reduction for descriptor systems," *Math. Control Signals Systems*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 297–319, 2004.

[11] P. Benner, E. S. Quintana-Ortí, and G. Quintana-Ortí, "Parallel model reduction of large-scale linear descriptor systems via balanced truncation," in *High Performance Computing for Computational Science - VECPAR 2004*, ser. Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., M. Daydé, J. J. Dongarra, V. Hernández, and J. M. L. M. Palma, Eds., vol. 3402. Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany: Springer-Verlag, 2005, pp. 340–353.

[12] T. Stykel, "Balanced truncation model reduction for semidiscretized Stokes equation," *Linear Algebra Appl.*, vol. 415, no. 2–3, pp. 262–289, 2006.

[13] M. Schmidt, "Systematic discretization of input/output maps and other contributions to the control of distributed parameter systems," Ph.D. dissertation, Technische Universität Berlin, May 2007.

[14] J. Saak, M. Köhler, and P. Benner, "M-M.E.S.S.-1.0.1 – the matrix equations sparse solvers library," DOI:10.5281/zenodo.50575, Apr. 2016, see also:www.mpi-magdeburg.mpg.de/projects/mess.

[15] P. Benner, "MORLAB – model order reduction laboratory," http://www.mpi-magdeburg.mpg.de/1657682/morlab.

[16] S. Werner, "Hankel-norm approximation of descriptor systems," Master's thesis, Otto-von-Guericke-Universität, Magdeburg, Germany, 2016.